

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.         | FILING DATE                 | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 09/881,526              | 06/14/2001                  | H. Ralph Snodgrass   | 441472000500             | 9899             |
| 25226                   | 7590 08/30/2006             |                      | EXAMINER                 |                  |
| MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP |                             |                      | SULLIVAN, DANIEL M       |                  |
| 755 PAGE M<br>PALO ALTO | 11LL RD<br>D, CA 94304-1018 |                      | ART UNIT                 | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                         |                             |                      | 1636                     |                  |
|                         |                             |                      | DATE MAIL ED: 08/30/2006 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Communication Box Annual  | 09/881,526                       | SNODGRASS, H. RALPH                   |  |  |  |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Communication Re: Appeal  | Examiner                         | Art Unit                              |  |  |  |
|   | Daniel M. Sullivan               | 1636                                  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| 1. The Notice of Appeal filed on is not acceptable because:   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (a) it was not timely filed.  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (b) the statutory fee for filing the appeal was not submitted. See 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1).  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (c) the appeal fee received on was not timely filed.  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (d) the submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. The appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(1) is \$  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (e) the appeal is not in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31(a)(1) in that no claim has been twice rejected.   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (f) a Notice of Allowability, PTO-37, was mailed by the Office on   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| 2. The appeal brief filed on is NOT acceptable for the reason(s) indicated below:   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (a) the brief and/or brief fee is untimely. See 37 CFR 41.37(a).  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (b) the statutory fee for filing the brief has not been submitted. See 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2).  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (c) the submitted brief fee of \$ is insufficient. The brief fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) is \$   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| The appeal in this application will be dismissed unless corrective action is taken to timely submit the brief and requisite fee. See 37 CFR 41.37(a)(1). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). See 37 CFR 41.37(e). |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| 3. ☑ The appeal in this application is DISMISSED I  | pecause:                         |                                       |  |  |  |
| (a) the statutory fee for filing the brief as required under 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2) was not timely submitted and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136(a) has expired.                         |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (b)   the brief was not timely filed and the period for obtaining an extension of time to file the brief under 37 CFR 1.136(a) has expired.   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (c) a Request for Continued Examination (F  | RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 was file | ed on                                 |  |  |  |
| (d)  other: <u>Abandonment of the application was confirmed by Gladys Monroy on 22 June 2006.</u>   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| 4.   Because of the dismissal of the appeal, this a   | pplication:                      |                                       |  |  |  |
| (a) 🔀 is abandoned because there are no allowed claims.   |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) is before the examiner for final disposition because it contains allowed claims. Prosecution<br/>on the merits remains CLOSED.</li> </ul>  |                                  |                                       |  |  |  |
| (c) is before the examiner for consideration.   |                                  | , •                                   |  |  |  |
|   | ¥                                | DE DO                                 |  |  |  |
|   |                                  | DANIEL M. SULLIVAN<br>PATENT EXAMINER |  |  |  |

Application No.

Applicant(s)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-461 (Rev. 9-04)

Part of Paper No. 20060625

1.00